



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,108	10/31/2003	Michael Altenhofen	13909-055001 / 2000E00019	8924
32864	7590	06/29/2009		
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
JACKSON, JENISE E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2439				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/29/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/698,108

**Applicant(s)**

ALTENHOFEN, MICHAEL

**Examiner**

JENISE E. JACKSON

**Art Unit**

2439

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-10, 21 and 23-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-10, 21, 23-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In view of the appeal brief filed on 4/17/09, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1, 3-10, 21, 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 35 U.S.C § 101 process must (1) be tied to a

particular machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In re Bilski et al, 88 USPQ 2d 1385 CAFC (2008); Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the particular machine to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Here, applicant's method steps are not tied to a particular machine and do not perform a transformation. Thus, the claims are non-statutory.

The mere recitation of the machine in the preamble with an absence of a machine in the body of the claim fails to make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101. *Note the Board of Patent Appeals Informative Opinion Ex parte Langemyer et al.*

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Floyd et al(6,243,692).

5. As per claims 1, 11, Floyd discloses a method of providing an application core(i.e. protection module) of a software application(see col. 2, lines 1-14) with access to version-specific functionality(see col. 3, lines 52-66), determining a version of the software application(see col. 3, lines 43-51), providing a module link(i.e. unlock module) that corresponds to the version(see col. 4, lines 19-25), authenticating the module link(i.e. unlock module) by verifying against a code that is unique to a user, the module link being used by the application core(i.e. protection module) to access the version-specific functionality(see col. 2, lines 28-39, see col. 4, lines 18-25, 33-35); wherein the application core(i.e. protection module) comprises software that is common across multiple versions(i.e. trial versions) of the application(see col. Lines 58-67, col. 2, lines 1-4), the version includes one of the multiple versions, and the version-specific functionality includes functionality that is specific to the version of the software application(see col. 3, lines 43-51, col. 4, lines 18-25).
6. As per claims 3, 13, Floyd discloses encrypting the module link(i.e. unlock module) before providing the module link(see col. 4, lines 51-67).
7. As per claims 4, 14, Floyd discloses wherein the module link is encrypted with a public key that corresponds to a user of the software application(see col. 2, lines 37-41, col. 4, lines 52-63).
8. As per claims 5, 15, Floyd discloses receiving the public key used for encrypting the module link(see col. 4, lines 51-63).
9. As per claims 6, 16, Floyd discloses wherein the module link enables the application core(i.e. trial DLL) access to the version-specific functionality by enabling the application core to reference the version specific functionality(see col. 4, lines 18-25).

10. As per claims 7, 17, Floyd discloses wherein the module link enables the application core to access the version-specific functionality by enabling the application core to downloading the version specific functionality and to incorporate the version specific functionality into the application core(see col. 1, lines 52-66, col. 2, lines 1-4, col. 3, lines 5-10, 24-26, 43-66).

11. As per claims 8, 18, Floyd discloses wherein the module link comprises configuration settings for the application core(see col. 4, lines 3-7, 18-25).

12. As per claims 9, 19, Floyd discloses receiving identification information(i.e. license the user purchased) that corresponds to a user of the software application; wherein the version of the software application is determined using the identification information(see col. 2, lines 38-41, col. 3, lines 52-66) .

### ***Response to Applicant***

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-10, 21, 23-28 are persuasive. Thus, new art has been applied to claims.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENISE E. JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-3791. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex time, but generally in the office M-Fri(8-4:30)..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

June 18, 2009  
/J. E. J./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2439

/Edan Orgad/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439